

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been rejected and are currently under consideration. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-6, and 8-10 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Hillman (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,649). The Examiner states, in part:

Hillman teaches a CVD apparatus that includes: . . . a metal diffuser 44 partitioning the inner space of the chamber into a first and second partitions, having a plurality of holes, and includes an extension overlapping a surface of a quartz insulating frame 52

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part:

a diffuser partitioning the inner space of the chamber into first and second partitions and having an extension extended out from a boundary, wherein the extension of the diffuser is exposed to the inner space of the chamber (Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that Hillman fails to teach or suggest the claimed device. In particular, the Examiner has failed to indicate how Hillman teaches or suggests that the diffuser has an extension extended out from a boundary, as recited in claim 1. In addition, Hillman fails to teach or suggest that the extension of the diffuser is exposed to the inner space of the chamber. As can be seen in Fig. 1 of Hillman, the portion of the showerhead 44 which overlaps the upper insulator plate 52 is covered on the bottom by the lower insulator plate 50 and is not exposed to the inner space of the chamber.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under § 102(b) is unsupported by Hillman. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 7, 11, and 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Hillman and Zhao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,558,717).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Zhao reference fails to teach or suggest that the diffuser has an extension extended out from a boundary, or that the extension of the diffuser is exposed to the inner space of the chamber, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the Zhao reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Hillman, as described above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 7 is unsupported by the Hillman and Zhao references, and that the rejection under § 103 of claims 2, 3, and 7 should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, in part:


a diffuser partitioning the inner space of the chamber into first and second partitions and having an extension of an “L” shape extended out from a boundary, wherein the extension of the diffuser is exposed to the inner space of the chamber (emphasis added.)

As described above, neither Hillman nor Zhao teach or suggest a diffuser having an extension extended out from a boundary, wherein the extension is exposed to the inner space of the chamber. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 11 and 12, which depends from claim 11.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Should any other action be contemplated by the Examiner, it is respectfully requested that he contacts the undersigned at (408) 392-9250 to discuss the application.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 20, 2006.


Attorney for Applicant(s)

7/20/2006
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Hugh H. Matsubayashi
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,779